	Case 1:20-cv-00540-DAD-JLT Documer	nt 16 Filed 08/18/20 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ZURI S. YOUNG,	No. 1:20-cv-00540-DAD-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
14	J. GODWIN, et al.,	(Doc. No. 15)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Zuri S. Young is a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> in this closed civil rights	
18	action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge	
19	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On June 26, 2020, the undersigned adopted findings and recommendations issued by the	
21	assigned magistrate judge, denying plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and	
22	dismissing this action without prejudice. (Doc. No. 9.) The court agreed with the magistrate	
23	judge's findings that four of plaintiff's prior cases were dismissed for failure to state a cognizable	
24	claim, and that plaintiff's complaint in this action failed to show that he was under imminent	
25	danger of serious physical injury. (Id. at 2-3.) Plaintiff appealed from that order of dismissal, and	
26	his appeal is currently pending before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. (See Doc. Nos. 11,	
27	12.)	
28	/////	

Case 1:20-cv-00540-DAD-JLT Document 16 Filed 08/18/20 Page 2 of 2

On August 12, 2020, plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. (Doc. No. 15.) Plaintiff argues therein, among other things, that he is entitled to in forma pauperis status, that none of his prior cases that were dismissed should have counted as strike dismissals (or been dismissed at all), and that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. (See id.) Because plaintiff's appeal concerns these very same matters, the court does not have jurisdiction over plaintiff's motion. See Pyrodyne Corp. v. Pyrotronics Corp., 847 F.2d 1398, 1403 (9th Cir. 1988) ("filing of notice of appeal . . . divested the district court of jurisdiction over the matters appealed"). Accordingly,

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. No. 15) is denied;
- 2. This court will not entertain any further motions filed by plaintiff during the pendency of his appeal, unless directed to do so by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **August 18, 2020**